

REMARKS

A total of 35 claims remain in the present application. The foregoing amendments are presented in response to the Advisory Action mailed March 27, 2007, wherefore reconsideration of this application is requested.

By way of the above-noted amendments, claim 35 has been amended to even more distinctly define features of the present invention. In particular, claim 35 had been amended to emphasize that a "plurality of different member profiles [are] associated with the team member". New claims 36-40 are directed to features described in the original specification but not previously claimed, and which are believed to provide further grounds for patentability.

In preparing the above-noted amendments, careful attention was paid to ensure that no new subject matter has been introduced.

Referring now to the text of the Advisory Action: the Examiner has asserted that

- "... the features upon which applicant relies (i.e.. "that a party (or requester) may have multiple different profiles) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claim is directed to 'define a plurality of member profiles associated with the team member...'. “;
- The applicant argues that reference fails to teach "different communications preferences of each party". The Examiner disagrees. The reference teaches "pseudonyms" for each party. In response to a request the CPU 205 transmits previously authorized data along with respective pseudonyms to each party (See col. 8, line 51 - 67).
- The applicant argues that reference fails to teach "a user interface (party terminal or requester terminal) that enables the user to "select one of the plurality of member profiles as a current profile. The party and requestor authorize the release

of certain information for each other along with respective pseudonyms (see col. 7, line 7 - 52 and col. 8, line 51 - 67

With respect, Applicant does not understand the Examiner's arguments. In particular:

The examiner asserts that "features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that a party (or requester) may have multiple different profiles) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)", but then admits that "The claim is directed to 'define a plurality of member profiles associated with the team member...'",. It is not understood how a person of ordinary skill in the art could interpret the claimed recitation of "a plurality of member profiles associated with the team member, each member profile ... comprising communications information defining a respective set of preferences of the team member for participating in each one of a plurality of different types of communications" to mean anything other than that the member profiles would necessarily be different from one another. In any event, and solely for the purpose of further emphasis, claim 35 has been amended to explicitly define "a plurality of different member profiles associated with the team member".

The examiner asserts that "the reference teaches pseudonyms of each party". Further, the Examiner asserts that "The party and requestor authorize the release of certain information for each other along with respective pseudonyms" Applicant does not dispute that Walker et al teaches assigning pseudonyms to each party, and forwarding authorized information along with the pseudonym to a requester. However, Applicant does not understand the Examiner's association between Walker's pseudonyms and the communications preferences and user-selected current profile of the present invention. According to Walker et al, a respective pseudonym is assigned to each party, and sent to a requester along with authorised information provided by the party. While the pseudonym may be composed from the party's telephone number or e-mail address, Walker et al do not teach or suggest that there is any relationship between the pseudonym and anything similar to "communications information defining a respective set of preferences of the team member for participating in each one of a plurality of different types of communications" as required by claim 35. Furthermore, while a party can enter authorised information that may be sent to a requester, Walker et al do not teach or

suggest that there is any possibility of entering a plurality of profiles, and/or selecting one of the plurality of profiles as a current profile.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the presently claimed invention is clearly distinguishable over the teaching of the cited references, taken alone or in any combination. Thus it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and early action in that respect is courteously solicited.

If any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this response, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-5113.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent Daniels/
By: Kent Daniels, P.Eng.
Reg. No. 44206
Attorney for the Applicants

Date: April 11, 2007

Ogilvy Renault
Suite 1600
1981 McGill College Avenue
Montreal, Quebec
Canada, H3A 2Y3
(613) 780-8673